DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 389 698 SP 036 345

TITLE	Teacher Education Strategic Planning Panel Report, March 1995.
INSTITUTION	Colorado Commission on Higher Education, Denver.
PUB DATE	Mar 95
NOTE	57p.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Bachelors Degrees; Degree Requirements; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Graduate Study; Higher Education; Policy Formation; *Preservice Teacher Education; Program Design; *State Regulation; Undergraduate Study
IDENTIFIERS	*Colorado

ABSTRACT

This document presents recommendations for Colorado state teacher education policy additions and changes based on a review of existing policies and in light of current changes in the professional education field. The recommendations are: (1) do not reinstate undergraduate degrees in education; (2) accept interdisciplinary majors for teacher education when they meet certain criteria; (3) allow undergraduate students intending to become teachers to complete all requirements for a degree and for teacher licensure in a planned eight-semester program; (4) the teacher licensure component of post-baccalaureate programs should be the same undergraduate courses required of students completing an eight-semester Bachelor's degree with licensure requirements; (5) continue programs combining licensure requirements with Master's degree requirements, with stipulations; (6) continue limiting teacher education licensure programs to 20-42 semester hours with a Bachelor's degree program; (7) 4-year institutions should deliver licensure/pedagogy components and only at the upper level; (8) accept the University of Northern Colorado's (UNC) definition of its designation as the state's primary teacher education institution; (9) do not encourage development of new programs; (10) K-12/higher education partnerships are strongly endorsed; (11) retain the current configuration for access to programs in teacher education; (12) encourage appropriate technology; (13) hold programs accountable for students' knowledge and performance in teacher education; (14) do not establish a Bachelor's in early childhood education; (15) establish a permanent education advisory committee to review programs; (16) codify certain policies stemming from past reports. An appendix lists members of the panel making the recommendations, the UNC role definition, a statement on elimination of undergraduate education degrees from deans of education; and responses from deans of education to questions on licensure and standards-based education, and a draft codification of teacher education policy. (JB)

ED 389 698

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. Kinnaird

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP036345

COLORADO COMMISSION ON

HIGHER EDUCATION

ACCESS TO HIGH-QUALITY, AFFORDABLE EDUCATION FOR ALL COLORADANS

TEACHER EDUCATION STRATEGIC PLANNING PANEL REPORT

MARCH 1995

1300 Broadway, Second Floor • Denver, Colorado 80203 • (303) 866-2723
DWAYNE C. NUZUM, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

TEACHER EDUCATION STRATEGIC PLANNING PANEL REPORT

March 1995

COLORADO COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

PURPOSE OF THE COMMISSION'S REVIEW OF TEACHER EDUCATION POLICY

Teacher education policies were originally created by the Commission's study of the field of education and its actions responding to the legislative directives contained in HB 85-1187. During 1992-93 the Commission staff recognized that many changes were occurring in the field of professional education, some of which could have an impact upon teacher education and could affect the existing Commission policies on teacher education. In 1993, the Commission staff assembled a panel of persons interested in and knowledgeable about teacher education with the charge to review the Commission's existing policies relating to teacher education found in its report to the General Assembly of March 1986 and to make recommendations to preserve, amend, delete, or create new policies.

The panel presented its first, partial, recommendations to the Commission in February 1994 and subsequently were sent to chief executive officers of higher education institutions for possible comment. No written comments were received. The panel then continued discussion of other issues arising out of the Commission's 1986 report to the General Assembly and responded to questions posed by the Commission's Executive Director late in 1994. The Commission staff has based a codification of Commission policies on both the 1986 report and the panel's recommendations. A draft of the codification of policies is included in the Appendix.

The Commission created extensive policy in its report to the General Assembly in March 1986. The draft codification of policies in the Appendix is based on policy that has existed since 1986 that has directed or influenced decisions and actions taken by higher education institutions in the field of teacher education. Because Commission policy remained in the 1986 report and was not codified, there has been some erosion in the knowledge of and observance of the policies. The Commission's directives were implemented by institutions, but some confusion exists about institutional roles and opportunities in the field of education.

While the staff believed that much of the policy articulated in the 1986 report continued to be desirable and relevant state policy and should be retained and clarified, the possibility was recognized that deletions, amendments, and new policy also were needed. A careful and objective review was considered necessary, which the panel provided.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE TEACHER EDUCATION PANEL

The recommendations of the teacher education panel:

1. Degrees in education should not be reinstituted at the undergraduate level.

   Since the mid-1980s national organizations, such as the Carnegie Commission on Education and the Economy and the Holmes Group, have recommended that beginning teachers have strong liberal arts backgrounds and knowledge of subject matter as well as training in pedagogy. Colorado became a leader in 1985 by requiring public higher education institutions to discontinue the undergraduate degree in education. Leaders of teacher education programs believe that students are academically better prepared today. Opportunity for collaboration between arts and sciences and education faculties has been increased.

2. Interdisciplinary majors should be accepted for teacher education when they meet certain criteria.

   The criteria that interdisciplinary programs should meet to be acceptable for students preparing to become teachers are the following:

   - General education requirements are not to be part of the interdisciplinary major.
   - The interdisciplinary major is to be constituted entirely by academic content and shall not include pedagogy or certification/licensure requirements.
   - The major shall not be solely or primarily for teacher education candidates.
   - One discipline among the two or more constituting the interdisciplinary major should be emphasized.
   - Courses integrating or synthesizing the field should be required.
   - There should be rigor in the academic requirements for the major (e.g., a certain number of upper division courses).
   - The academic areas that may constitute an acceptable interdisciplinary major are those that constitute a core body of knowledge or unifying research methodology (e.g., math and science, social science, humanities).

3. Students entering bachelor's degree programs with the goal of becoming teachers should be able to complete all requirements for a degree and for teacher licensure in a planned eight-semester program.

Completion of all courses in general education, the major field, and teacher education normally should be achievable in eight semesters if students enroll for a full course load and for the correct courses, complete all courses satisfactorily, do not change their major fields after beginning their third year, and meet entrance requirements to the teacher education program. Students who do not meet these criteria would be expected to take longer to complete their degree/teacher education programs. The panel acknowledges that in some fields, such as science, students may need to extend their programs to include courses from the several areas in which they may be asked to teach. Exceptions to the eight-semester bachelor's degree with teacher education should be allowed when evidence supports it.

The undergraduate teacher education component that normally is completed as part of a bachelor's degree program should continue to be open to older, non-traditional students who already have bachelor's (or higher) degrees.

4. The teacher licensure component of post-baccalaureate programs should be undergraduate courses, the same courses as required of students completing an eight-semester bachelor's degree with licensure requirements.

Certain institutions currently offer only post-baccalaureate or graduate level teacher education, the pre-service teacher education component that leads to initial teacher induction. The panel recommends that the teacher licensure component of post-baccalaureate programs be undergraduate courses, the same courses as required of students completing an eight-semester bachelor's degree with licensure requirements.

5. Programs combining licensure requirements with master's degree requirements should continue, but with the following stipulations:

(1) A master's degree shall not be required for initial licensure. A post-baccalaureate student entering a master's degree/licensure program must be able, if he or she wishes, to receive licensure without completing the master's degree upon completion of the courses required for licensure. Master's degree programs currently offered that incorporate certification/licensure requirements should be grandfathered until July 1, 1998. To continue to offer the program beyond that date, the sponsoring institution shall have presented a proposal to the Commission on Higher Education that provides a rationale for the program and describes the costs of the program, and shall have received formal approval from the Commission.

(2) Areas of professional education where state policy requires master's level training (e.g., school psychology) will be exceptions to the policies stated in (1), above.

6. The policy limiting the teacher education licensure program to a range of 20-42 semester hours within a bachelor's degree program should be continued.

The teacher education component currently is limited to 20 to 42 semester hours. The panel believes that these are reasonable parameters, but also believes that new methods of delivering instruction, such as self-paced instruction, and utilization of outcomes assessment may make the semester hour an inappropriate measure. The panel recommends that the semester hour limits be maintained, but that an institution may also plan a program employing alternative delivery methods and assessment measures that constitute not less than 20 percent and not more than 33 percent of a student's undergraduate experience, however that may be measured.

7. Courses in the teacher education (licensure/pedagogy) component should be at the upper division level and delivered only by four-year institutions.

Articulation agreements between two-year and four-year institutions enable a student to develop an articulated program in general education and in his/her major field. The teacher education component, which may be as little as 20 semester hours from the institution responsible for recommending students for licensure, should be at the institution having a specialized professional teacher education responsibility.

8. The University of Northern Colorado's definition of its designation as the state's primary teacher education institution should be accepted.

The panel accepts the University of Northern Colorado's definition of its role as the state's primary teacher education institution. (See the Appendix for the complete statement by the university.)

The university believes that the state has asked it to maintain programs for the preparation and continuing development of school-based education professionals. The state also expects the university to maintain a broad program of off-campus programs for educators. The university believes, therefore, that its "primary" role is based on the unique expectation that the university build a wide variety of on-campus and off-campus programs for the development of school professionals and the renewal of their schools.

The university explicitly does not define "primary" as "exclusive," and recognizes the role of other institutions in teacher education.

9. Development of new programs in teacher education is not encouraged.

The panel supports the configuration for access discussed in item 11, below. In general, a wide array of new programs is not believed to be necessary, particularly at the doctoral level where programs should be centralized at institutions that already have such programs and already have the extensive expertise needed to offer quality programs. The panel believes that it is likely that telecommunications technology will enable the delivery of some programs at locations where they are needed but are not currently available.

The panel recognizes that there will be emerging areas in which new programs will need to be developed. New programs should be considered when it can be documented conclusively that there is need for the proposed program in the state of Colorado, that the institution has the capability to offer a quality program, and that any new program will serve access needs.

10. K-12/higher education partnerships are strongly endorsed and should be expanded.

Alteration of state policy to require partnerships is not considered necessary or desirable, but appropriate state agencies should formally recognize and encourage partnerships. Particular attention should be given to thoughtfully constructed and enacted partnerships that promote improvement of public schools and the university. Examples include partner schools (also known as professional development schools or centers); and also collaborative efforts focused on specific disciplines.

The panel also encourages collaborative efforts between and among higher education institutions in working with public schools. Schools can benefit from the expertise available from several collaborating higher education institutions.

The panel further recommends that clinically-based methods courses taught at partner K-12 schools be considered part of the institution's resident instruction program.

11. The currently defined configuration for access to programs in teacher education should be retained.

The configuration is currently defined as follows: (1) "maximum geographic access" to initial certification and baccalaureate degrees; (2) "substantial access" to continuing education and recertification instruction, including the use of telecommunications for delivery; (3) "regional access" to graduate offerings at institutions that have a broad array of graduate programs; and (4) doctoral, educational specialist, and administrator training programs should not be decentralized, but offered by a limited number of institutions (but more than one) or through consortial arrangements.

The panel believes the defined configuration for the distribution of program offerings should be retained. The panel recommends that administrator training programs, rather than being centralized at a few institutions, be considered when proposed by other institutions when they can be shown to respond to regional access needs. (See the response, Section B, page 9.)

12. The use of technology should be encouraged by appropriate agencies and that state financial resources should be made available to enhance the technological capabilities of the institutions of higher education.

The panel further recommends, however, that complete programs or graduate degrees in education not be delivered off-campus through telecommunications technology. Some elements of educational programs at all levels may be suitable for telecommunications delivery, but the panel believes other elements are not. The training of high quality teachers requires some personal interaction among students and between students and faculty.

The panel further recommends that (1) higher education institutions be encouraged to recognize and respond to school districts' technology needs; (2) that instruction and utilization of technology should be integrated into all teacher education programs; (3) that instruction delivered off-campus through telecommunications technology should only be degree programs approved by CCHE, curricula approved by the institution, or courses that are from approved programs; and (4) that higher education faculty be provided training in the use of technology as part of professional development programs.

13. Teacher education programs should be held accountable for students' knowledge and performance in teacher education, but teacher education programs should not be held accountable for basic skills and academic competencies that students are expected to derive from general education and from their major fields.

Basic skills and academic competencies are the responsibility of the institution as a whole. The panel encourages institutions to ensure that colleges of arts and sciences and schools or colleges of education cooperate more fully in the preparation of teachers.

14. A bachelor's degree in early childhood education should not be established.

The panel strongly recommends that early childhood be a field of study offered as an Associate of Applied Science degree at community colleges which would prepare a graduate for immediate employment or for transfer (about 30 semester hours of general education) to a four-year college or university. A bachelor's degree in early childhood education would contradict current state policy, that the panel supports, that there will not be teacher education degrees at the undergraduate level.

An undergraduate major which focuses on child development would be satisfactory, but the panel does not recommend that such a program be part of teacher education programs or lead to licensure in early childhood education. The master's degree specialty in early childhood also is acceptable to the panel.

15. The establishment of a permanent education advisory committee to review education programs included in institutions' Academic Initiatives Reports (AIRs) is recommended.

    The advisory committee would make recommendations to the Commission concerning the need for the programs included in the AIRs. In addition to higher education representatives, the panel recommends the inclusion of a representative of the Colorado Department of Education on the committee.

16. The Commission on Higher Education should codify policies on teacher education stemming from the Commission's 1986 report to the General Assembly on teacher education and from the recommendations of this panel for inclusion in the Commission's compendium of policies.

Responses to Specific Requests from the Commission on Higher Education.

A. During the fall 1994, the panel asked deans of schools and colleges of education in public institutions to respond to the following questions concerning licensure and standards-based education posed by the Commission's executive director. Questions were also asked about the practicality of the panel's initial recommendations in light of laws on teacher licensure and standards-based education.

    1. What is higher education doing to meet licensure changes? Are any of the panel's recommendations affected by the licensure law?

    2. Can a planned eight-semester teacher education program accommodate standards-based education?

    3. How can the state be assured that standards-based education is, in fact, being incorporated into teacher education programs? What are some specific examples of how teacher education curricula are introducing standards-based education?

    4. Should teacher education departments' assessment and accountability activities be based on, or at least include, their graduates' performance on teacher licensure examinations?

    5. What are the schools of education doing to assist in the development of induction programs?

Response: The panel's recommendations are compatible with current teacher education licensure laws. Standards-based education can certainly be accommodated within an eight-semester degree program leading to licensure. The responses of the deans of education provide evidence that standards-based education is being incorporated into teacher education programs.

The panel's recommendations concerning assessment and accountability are found in the response to recommendation 7.

Teacher education deans or directors provided the following information:

In summary, there were common thrusts by the schools and colleges of education. Responses indicate that teacher education programs and courses within the programs were under review and were being redesigned to include standards-based education in their content. Methods courses, specifically, are being changed to include material related to the content standards. Since other academic areas of the institutions are involved with the preparation of teachers in the various academic disciplines, stronger relationships were being developed between the various academic disciplines and the schools of education. In addition, collaboration with school districts is being strengthened. Part of the effort has generally involved stronger and more definitive assessment of teacher education candidates and strengthening of teacher preparation by the alignment of general education and liberal arts course content.

In regard to induction programs, all of the institutions are assisting school districts with induction programs or have indicated their willingness and ability to provide assistance upon request. Assistance that already has been provided is the development of materials to assist school districts; offering of workshops for school district personnel; hosting regular mentor-inductee meetings; development of partnerships for collaboration between higher education institutions and K-12 schools; and, in one case, development of a new course related to the process.

The complete responses from the deans are included in the Appendix.

B. The panel makes recommendations on current institutional proposals to develop new programs in teacher education, as requested by the Commission on Higher Education.

The panel has reviewed the proposed new programs in education included in the Academic Initiatives Reports submitted to the Commission in the fall of 1994. Its recommendations follow.

The panel also recommends (Recommendation 7) the establishment of a permanent education advisory committee to review Academic Initiatives Reports and to make recommendations to the Commission. Membership on the committee should, in addition

to higher education representatives, include a representative of the Colorado Department of Education.

Recommendations on Education Programs Included in 1994 Academic Initiatives Reports:

University of Northern Colorado---Master's degree in unspecified area. The panel does not have enough information to determine whether another master's degree in education at UNC is needed or not.

Adams State College---Master's degree in Educational Administration. The panel recommends that the college be allowed to present a proposal, but that it must document that it has the capacity to offer a quality program, that the need for the program exists, and that the program would serve rural access needs, in particular. The panel does not necessarily support the establishment of this program. The revision of the "configuration" defined in item 11 on page 6, would enable the college to put forward this proposal.

University of Colorado at Denver---Ed.S. in School Psychology. The panel believes that school psychology is an area of need and that a new program warrants consideration by the Commission.

Mesa State College---Master's degree in Education. While Mesa State College has approval to develop master's degrees in education, the panel believes the college should offer a program consistent with the resources that it has and that it should not attempt to offer degrees in specialty areas for which it does not have and cannot readily develop needed resources. An example would be programs in special education.

As with Adams State College, the panel recommends that the college be allowed to present a proposal, but that it must document that it has the capacity to offer a quality program, that the need for the program exists, and that the program would serve rural access needs, in particular. The panel does not necessarily support the establishment of any program. The revision of the "configuration" defined in item 11 on page 6 would enable the college to put forward a proposal that would serve rural access needs.

University of Colorado at Colorado Springs---Ph.D. in Education. The panel does not believe that Ph.D. degrees should be offered by institutions other than the universities that currently offer them. The panel does not believe that Ph.D. programs should be widely available throughout the state, but that they should be centralized at the largest state institutions. To decentralize would be to increase costs and to risk having lower quality degrees.

Colorado State University---Ph.D. in Community College Administration. The panel will not make a recommendation on this program because it is beyond the scope of the charge to the panel.

University of Northern Colorado---M.A. in Geographic Education. The panel makes no recommendation. The university has withdrawn the proposal submitted to the Commission.

Appendix

Membership of the Teacher Education Panel

STATE OF COLORADO

Department of Higher Education
COLORADO COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Christine Johnson, Chair
Alexander E. Bracken, Vice-Chair
Marshall A. Crawford
Steven W. Farber
David E. Greenberg
Brian H. Hall
Robert L. Hawkins
J. Timothy Waters

Roy Romer
Governor

Dwayne C. Nuzum
Executive Director

Panel of Experts for Teacher Education Strategic Planning

Frank Johnson
Director of Professional Development
Colorado Education Association

Philip DiStefano, Dean
School of Education
University of Colorado at Boulder

Eugene Campbell
Executive Director, Professional Services
Colorado Department of Education

Carol A. Wilson, Executive Director
Colorado Partnership for Educational Renewal

Janice Hartmangruber
Deputy Executive Director
Colorado Association of School Executives

Nancy Hartley, Dean
College of Applied Human Sciences
Colorado State University

Roger Kovar, Dean
Arts and Sciences
University of Northern Colorado

Richard Trahan
Vice Chair, CFAC

Adele Phelan
President, The Clayton Foundation

Rick Voorhees
Director of Research and Planning
Colorado Community Colleges and Occupational Education System

Timothy M. Grieder
Academic Officer; Director of Continuing Education and Extended Academic Programs
Colorado Commission on Higher Education, Chair (ex officio)

February 13, 1995

1300 BROADWAY, SECOND FLOOR, DENVER, COLORADO 80203 • (303) 866-2723 • FAX #: 860-9750

The University of Northern Colorado's Definition of Its Role as the State's Primary Teacher Education Institution

UNC's Response to CCHE Questions Concerning Teacher Education

1. What is UNC's definition of "primary?"

On the fourth page of the 1986 "Report to the General Assembly on Education Degree Programs" prepared by the Colorado Commission on Higher Education, it is reported that "the University of Northern Colorado shall be the primary institution for undergraduate and graduate teacher education in the State of Colorado." Throughout HB 1187 and the subsequent CCHE policies, the definition of "primary" was never developed, and it is the lack of definition that has caused the confusion over what "primary" both denotes and connotes.

"Primary" could be defined to connote a number of meanings, including: 1) the "primary" mission of UNC is professional education; or 2) given how the state has allocated resources to the institutions of higher education, "primary" consideration is given to UNC to develop and deliver a wide variety of education programs; or 3) that among state higher education institutions, UNC has the "primary" responsibility to assist schools in renewal; or 4) within UNC, assisting schools in renewal is "primary" to our mission.

Perhaps the best definition of "primary" communicates that UNC is expected by "the state" to maintain an ongoing responsibility for the preparation and continuing development of school-based education professionals. The University demonstrates this definition through its diverse array of undergraduate and graduate programs in professional education. Through its undergraduate and graduate programs, UNC prepares education professionals for a wide variety of roles, including teachers, counselors, school psychologists, principals, superintendents, higher education administrators, and professors both in education broadly defined, and in discipline-based teacher education. "Primary" also includes the fact that the state has expected UNC to maintain broad-scale off-campus programs designed to expand and enhance school professionals' skills as educators. To accentuate this point, in the 1992-93 academic year alone, 11 off-campus programs were offered in 9 sites to an unduplicated headcount of 394 students. Thus, through practice and expectation, UNC has come to define "primary" as the institution of higher education uniquely expected to build a wide variety of on-campus and off-campus programs for the development of school professionals and the renewal of their schools.

It is also important to note how we do **not** define "primary." We do not define "primary" to mean "exclusive," as in UNC having the sole responsibility for off-campus instruction in Colorado. Rather, we realistically look at the variety of problems and issues faced by school professionals and welcome the participation of appropriately selected graduate programs in education offered by other institutions to help all Colorado schools maintain ongoing renewal. In addition, UNC does **not** define "primary" as offering undergraduate teacher preparation in off-campus sites. On many occasions, we have been contacted by schools and school districts in the metropolitan Denver area to offer an initial teacher preparation program at the undergraduate level, and on each occasion, we have resisted. We have **not** taken "primary" simply to mean either on-campus or off-campus undergraduate teacher preparation. Rather, we have defined "primary" as meaning improving the environment for teaching and learning in schools, across the campus, and throughout our professional education programs.

2. How does the designation serve the state?

The designation as interpreted above focuses the funding for higher education's role in school renewal. There is a general impression that because UNC does not offer all of its graduate programs in professional education in all corners of the state every semester that it is somehow not meeting its obligation under HB 1187. The number of sites, programs, and students noted above are clear indications that UNC works honestly and diligently to serve the educators in the state. The nine off-campus sites for 1992-93 are across the state and include: Limon, Ft. Morgan, Brush, Sterling, Denver, Colorado Springs, Glenwood Springs, Gunnison, and Grand Junction. Since 1987, other programs have already been completed in some of these sites as well as in Pueblo, Lamar, La Junta, and Craig. A new program will begin in Steamboat Springs in fall of 1994. Because of the way teachers seek graduate programs, it is easy to locate school professionals who report being "untouched" by UNC's offerings. The question remains, however, whether these same educators would take advantage of any other programs offered in their geographic areas. To the extent that our programs reach across the state, UNC can be found helping school professionals expand their skills.

We offer these various statewide programs within a set of constraints that generally stress the institution. First, we are limited in what we can offer by the amount of state appropriation we receive to support off-campus programs. Second, we are limited by CCHE policies controlling off-campus programs by all state higher education institutions. Third, we have created a self-imposed limitation through our commitment to involving regular UNC faculty in the delivery of off-campus programs rather than using a high proportion of adjuncts as can commonly be found in many off-campus programs elsewhere. Limited funds, regulation, and a penchant to make our off-campus programs as sound and as rigorous as the same programs offered on-campus, are constraints and not excuses, but they are used to generate criticisms of our commitment.

3. What effect does the designation have on other institutions?

It is difficult for us to comment completely on the impact the designation has on other institutions because we cannot be certain we understand them as intimately as they do. We are certain that our sister institutions see some ways in which our HB 1187 designation has affected them negatively, and we feel that this question is best answered by them. We can only speculate that a positive effect on other institutions has probably been to allow and encourage them to develop greater individuality as institutions, and hence bring greater diversity to the state's higher education system. Other institutions are able (as are we) to focus their resources on their distinct state-assigned missions. For example, while graduate level research can be focused more sharply at the institutions in the CU system, the institutions in the state college system can focus their resources on high quality undergraduate education. Such individuality and diversity afford the state a reduction in competition for a limited number of students, as well as a reduction in the duplication of programs proliferating around the state. Moreover, it allows for the development of selective expertise, especially in graduate education.

It must also be noted that reduced duplication would save money for the state, if other programs targeted for discontinuance through HB 1187, and subsequent CCHE action in 1986, had actually been deleted.

4. What effect does the designation have on UNC?

We believe the effects on UNC are the effects intended by the passage of HB 1187. Specifically, HB 1187 allows and encourages UNC to focus its institutional role and mission to design academic and professional programs and University procedures around the improvement of teaching and professional education. The designation also affords a cost-benefit for the state in that it has in UNC an institution that is expected to develop broad and comprehensive program offerings for educators. Furthermore, it sets the expectation that UNC will be the primary institution in the state for assisting schools in their renewal efforts. As a result of this, the faculty regularly engage in discussions of teaching which lead to the development of new program offerings and the redesign of existing programs.

In addition, we believe that students are attracted to UNC to study education because the state funds the institution to pursue broad and in-depth study in the field. The institution has taken the mission of professional education to include the development of teaching expertise in its faculty. In the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, and Education, candidates for faculty positions must teach a class while being observed by the dean of the appropriate college, the search committee, and (obviously) the students whom they will teach in the future. The "primary" designation has led to a "Scholarship of Teaching" series that brings together faculty/scholars from a wide variety of disciplines to improve their teaching through peer coaching activities. It is hoped that this designation had led to improved teaching in both on-campus and off-campus programs.

The designation also has the effect of attracting graduate students and faculty to UNC. Students and faculty are attracted to the institution because of the wide variety of education programs available, the Laboratory School and its innovative practices, and because of the opportunity to work at a University where professional education is not an afterthought. Many undergraduate and graduate students, and many faculty looking for an institution that maintains commitments to teaching and its study are attracted to UNC. The public designation of UNC as Colorado's primary institution for professional education has helped to create this campus environment.

5. What can UNC do with the designation that it could not do without the designation (or what can it not do with the designation that it could do without it)?

In sum, there is probably no special advantage gained over other institutions. It seems to us that other institutions have continued to offer a variety of off-campus programs under their existing authorizations, and it appears that more are on the drawing board. Also, the number of on-campus programs at the various state institutions has not (with the exception of graduate programs at Western State College) been significantly reduced in a manner that would suggest that UNC's designation as "primary" reflected any significant shift in state resources. Some programs at other institutions that were to have been discontinued still exist. In several instances, graduate degree programs have continued to operate as "emphasis areas" under remaining authorized degree programs.

It seems to us that while students are attracted to UNC, a significant amount are attracted to the other institutions in the state offering graduate programs. It may ultimately be a question of convenience rather than one of quality. The designation has not brought us significant new money, nor have we interpreted "primary" to mean "exclusivity." We could even make the case that the

money allocated to support off-campus graduate programs is insufficient to do the job responsibly. When we have been challenged by other institutions for offering off-campus programs in their "territory", we remind them that while other institutions have been assigned geographic "service areas" by statute and CCHE action, UNC has been assigned the entire state as a service area. We strive to respect territory, but that does not change the reality of the expectation created by HB 1187. The only other institution with that authority and the accompanying expectation is CSU, with their statewide authorization being limited to graduate programs in vocational teacher education (which UNC does not offer).

Altogether, the improvement of education is an historical commitment of UNC. It extends far beyond the individual players on the campus today. There is an expectation that UNC is Colorado's "education university," and we try to reach all parts of the state.

29 Sept 93

Deans of Education Support for Continued Elimination of Undergraduate Education Degrees and Semester Hour Limits on Teacher Education Components

University of Colorado at Boulder
School of Education
Office of the Dean

Education 124, Campus Box 249
Boulder, Colorado 80309-0249

Fax: (303) 492-7090
Telephone: (303) 492-6937

August 25, 1993

TO: Members of the Teacher Education Panel

FROM: Phil DiStefano

RE: **Decision on Undergraduate Degree in Education**

(Note: I was asked by our group to generate a rationale for our decision to support the CCHE recommendation to discontinue the undergraduate degree. Please review my statement below by the next meeting.)

The Teacher Education Panel voted unanimously to support CCHE's recommendation to discontinue the undergraduate degree in education. The Panel's rationale for the decision is based upon the following points:

1. Since the mid eighties, national organizations, such as the Carnegie Commission on Education and the Economy and the Holmes Group, have recommended that beginning teachers have a strong, liberal arts background and subject matter knowledge as well as training in pedagogy. The state of Colorado became a leader in the country in 1985 by requiring all public higher education institutions to discontinue the undergraduate degree in education.

2. Most Deans and Directors of Education in the state of Colorado believe that the students in teacher education programs today are academically better than students who were enrolled in an undergraduate education major.

3. By having teacher certification students enrolled in a liberal arts degree program, there is more of an opportunity for faculty in Arts & Sciences and other colleges to collaborate with Education faculty on programmatic issues.

Given these points of view, the Teacher Education Panel supports CCHE's recommendation on the undergraduate major in education.

COLORADO COUNCIL OF DEANS OF EDUCATION

November 2,1993

TO: CCHE Task Force on Teacher Education

FROM: Phil DiStefano

RE: CCODE Meeting

At the most recent CCODE meeting held on October 29, 1993, the members of CCODE unanimously passed the following motion:

The Colorado Council of Deans of Education supports the recommendations of the CCHE Task Force on Teacher Education to eliminate the undergraduate degree in education and to limit the hours of professional education to a maximum of 42 hours.

However, the Council of Deans believes that the state of Colorado needs a combination of undergraduate, post-BA and graduate programs in teacher education to recruit and prepare first-year teachers to respond to K12 needs.

Adams State College
Alamosa, Colorado

Colorado College
Colorado Springs, Colorado

Colorado State University
Ft. Collins, Colorado

Ft. Lewis College
Durango, Colorado

Metropolitan State College
Denver, Colorado

Regis College
Denver, Colorado

University of Colorado at Boulder
Boulder, Colorado

University of Colorado at Colorado Springs
Colorado Springs, Colorado

University of Colorado at Denver
Denver, Colorado

University of Denver
Denver, Colorado

University of Northern Colorado
Greeley, Colorado

University of Southern Colorado
Pueblo, Colorado

Western State College
Gunnison, Colorado

Complete Response from the Deans of Education
to Questions on Licensure and Standards-Based Education

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSES:

ACCOMMODATING LICENSURE REQUIREMENTS,

STANDARDS-BASED EDUCATION, AND INDUCTION

School of Education
University of Colorado, Boulder

1. What is high education doing to meet licensure changes?

The School of Education at the University of Colorado, Boulder offers an initial teaching license for elementary education (K-6) and secondary education (7-12) in the following areas: English, foreign language (French, German, Italian, Spanish, Japanese, Russian, Latin), mathematics, science and social studies. The School also offers a K-12 license in art education and music education. At the advanced level, the School offers a license in linguistically different (bilingual), linguistically different (English as a Second Language), reading teacher, and special education (Teacher 1: Moderate Needs).

Beginning Fall Semester, 1995, the School will introduce major changes in the elementary and secondary teacher education program which account for 65 percent of the students in the School of Education. The undergraduate elementary and secondary teacher education programs will be designed to provide qualified and committed students with solid preparation as first-year teachers. Acknowledging that the nature of schools, the communities we serve, and the knowledge we have of teaching and learning have changed a great deal in the last decade, the two programs will incorporate coursework and school experiences designed to prepare students for increasingly complex demands of teaching in a diverse society. The programs include a) an emphasis on subject area knowledge, b) current, research-based approaches to teaching and learning, c) multicultural perspectives, d) a commitment to equity in the schools, e) strong partnerships with local schools and teachers, and f) approaches and professional attitudes that encourage reflective thinking, effective decision-making, and collaboration. These changes correspond to the new licensure changes and standards for first-year teachers. Similar changes based upon the standards for advanced licensure in teaching areas will be made in the near future.

2. What are some specific examples of how teacher education curricula are introducing standards-based education?

Two areas where the teacher education curricula are introducing standards-based education are in general studies and professional studies. It is important that prospective elementary teachers have a knowledge background in the standards that they will be teaching to their students. All students receiving a Bachelor of Arts Degree and a teaching license must take a minimum of 40 semester hours in the liberal arts. These hours are part of the core curriculum required by the College of Arts and Sciences and include the following topics: 1) Skills Acquisition (foreign language, quantitative reasoning and mathematical skills, written communication and critical thinking). 2) Content Areas of Study (historical context, culture and gender diversity, United States context, literature and the arts, natural science, contemporary societies, and ideals and values). Beginning this summer, Arts and Sciences advisors will have a list of recommended courses for prospective education students under each of the areas of skills acquisition and content areas of study. These recommended courses will parallel the content standards specified in HB-1313.

In the professional studies sequence that students will take beginning Fall Semester, 1995, the standards will be integrated into the content methods courses at the elementary and secondary level. All prospective elementary teachers must take a methods course in reading, language arts, children's literature, social studies, science, and mathematics. Each faculty member teaching these methods courses will be expected to cover content area standards in their classes. At the secondary level, faculty teaching the content methods (English, foreign language, mathematics, science, and social studies) will also be expected to cover content area standards for secondary students.

Assessment practices will also be integrated in the content area methods classes at both the elementary and secondary levels. Expert faculty members in the area of assessment will team teach the content area methods classes during part of the semester to integrate the assessment unit with the courses and their corresponding field experiences. The students in the classes will develop assessment instruments in the various contents that deal with the standards.

3. What are the schools of education doing to assist in the development of induction programs?

The School of Education has had an induction program with a number of school districts on the front range since 1987. Three school districts--Adams County #12, Boulder Valley, and St. Vrain Valley--joined the Partners in Education (PIE) Program in 1987. Two additional districts--Brighton and Adams County #50 in Westminster--joined the partnership this past year. The purpose of the partnership is three-fold. The first is to involve outstanding public school teachers in the licensure programs. In any given year, seven to ten teachers are in the program teaching undergraduate methods classes, supervising student teachers, or working with faculty on research projects to improve teacher education. These clinical professors are paid by their school districts to participate in the program for a two-year period. The second purpose is to have University faculty working in the public schools conducting research, evaluating programs, and providing workshops for staff development. The third purpose is to provide first-year teachers with an induction program where the clinical faculty serve as coaches and mentors for the first-year teachers. The first-year teachers teach full time and work on a Master's Degree in education. Their salaries are lower than regular first-year teachers; however, the school districts pay for fifteen hours of their graduate work.

Data from the from the past seven years indicate that the PIE induction program is very successful. Ninety percent of the first-year teachers are still in the teaching profession. This compares with data from Schlechty and Vance (1983) that indicate 40-50 percent of beginning teachers leave the profession during the first seven years of teaching and over two-thirds of these teachers leave within the first four years. Presently, a study is being conducted to compare first-year PIE teachers with other first-year teachers hired in these districts to see if attrition rates are similar or different.

Qualitative data also indicate that the PIE teachers are very satisfied with the induction program, especially in the areas of coaching and mentoring, professional growth, and their graduate programs. The data also indicate that principals and other teachers in the buildings support the induction program.

WESTERN
STATE COLLEGE OF COLORADO

Department of Education & Geography
(303) 943-2030

November 22, 1994

Dear Mr. Nuzum:

My name is Nancy Gaylen. I am the chair of the Department of Education and Geography at Western State College in Gunnison, Colorado. I met you at the CCODE retreat in Durango in September. I would like to tell you a little bit about what Western's teacher education program is doing in regards to three items:

1. how we are meeting licensure changes
2. some specific examples of how we are introducing standards-based education into the curriculum
3. what we are doing to assist in the development of induction programs for beginning teachers.

I will address each item with *specific examples*

I. Meeting new licensure laws

a. Western State College lobbied to become a testing site for the PLACE exam. For students located in a remote, rural site such as Gunnison, Western State College can offer the PLACE exam on its campus to relieve students from the extra expense of overnight travel.

b. Western's Academic Support Center is planning to offer review sessions for student's preparing to take the basic skills portion of the PLACE exam.

c. Academic departments that must prepare teacher education students for the 'content specific' portion of the PLACE exam have received test objectives to ensure that these objectives are taught somewhere in that academic major.

d. Students preparing to exit the teacher education program at Western must build a professional portfolio. They begin this in the instructional design course and finish it after student teaching.

WESTERN STATE COLLEGE OF COLORADO • GUNNISON, COLORADO 81231

e. Western State College is ready to put forth a new general education program. This general education program combines skill building in competency areas, a chosen liberal studies minor, and a capstone experience. The liberal studies minor will integrate natural science, arts, and humanities. This new general education program will better prepare our teacher education candidates for the Liberal Arts portion of the PLACE exam.

2. Introducing Standards-based education into curriculum

a. The department of Education chose ED 291: Instructional Design as a starting point for students to learn about Standards based education.

In this course we are covering the following *topics*

1. what is standards based education?
2. looking at national and state standards
3. learning how to design and score performance tasks using rubrics
4. learning about alternative assessments such as portfolios

Some of the *methods* we employ to accomplish these topics are:

1. we are using Gunnison RE-1J School District's TOSA, who is in charge of instigating SBE in the district, to conduct several class sessions at the college

2. we do hands on activities (i.e. one activity uses magnets) where students are able to actually design a performance task with an assessment rubric for use with children.

3. students start to build their own professional portfolio and in doing so, learn about this particular form of alternative assessment.

4. students work closely with Gunnison teachers who are instigating portfolio assessment, performance tasks, and grading using rubrics into their classrooms. Standards based education is being instigated in the Gunnison RE-1J schools, thus our students can see how it works, first hand.

b. Particular national and state standards and how to design curriculum at various grade levels will be covered in the methodology courses. Elementary and Secondary methods professors have incorporated these topics into their course syllabi.

c. The Western State College/Gunnison RE-1J Schools and Community CONNECT Consortium is launching a publicity/education campaign to inform parents and community members about standards based education in our district, how math and science is being taught in the classrooms using national and state standards, and how our children are being assessed by their performance and portfolios. The CONNECT steering committee members are also making plans to inform *all* college faculty (not just those involved with teacher education) about the need for standards for K-16.

3. Induction programs for beginning teachers
Last year, when it became apparent that induction programs would be required of school districts desiring to hire new teachers, our department of education wrote a letter to every school district superintendent who we regularly work with in the placement of student teachers. We offered to be of assistance to those districts who were ready to begin planning an induction program. Since that time, we have not heard back from anyone. It is my intention to keep pursuing the opportunities to work with school districts in their planning of induction programs, when they are ready.

Thank you for the opportunity to explain to you specifically what Western State College is doing to help students meet new licensure laws and learn about standards based education. Many of the examples are 'just a beginning' but I am pleased with our progress so far. I hope the information is helpful to you when speaking to the Achievement Commission and other state legislators. If you have any questions, feel free to call me.

Sincerely,

Dr Nancy Gaylen

Dr. Nancy I. Gaylen
Chair, Department of Education and Geography
Western State College, Gunnison, Colorado
(303) 943-7041

cc: Mr. Tim Grieder

Recent Changes in Teacher Education at UNC

November 16, 1994

A. What is higher education doing to meet the licensure changes?
B. What are some specific examples of how teacher education curricula are introducing standards-based education (e.g., standards setting, new assessment practices)?

New preservice teacher education programs at the University of Northern Colorado are currently being reviewed by Undergraduate Council for inclusion in the next bulletin. All programs have been redesigned by the faculty to reflect the new standards resulting from HB 1005. Thus, it is anticipated that all students who enter into teacher education in August, 1995 will matriculate into new programs comprised of more coherently-linked, properly sequenced, and integrated courses and experiences.

Specifically, the new standards have been used in a holistic manner to reflect both their letter and spirit in the new coursework and experiences. There is no course on the "democratic ideal" but there are new strands that run across courses that keep the spirit of this standard central in the preparation of teachers. The remaining four standards can be found throughout the programs in similar ways. It is intended that the new programs will continually treat these standards in their many manifestations. Moreover, each standard was identified for the degree to which it will be addressed in each appropriate course. For example, it is expected that the methods classes will address the standard on content-based pedagogy. Or the courses on teaching with technology will address the power of communicating with multi-media to address the standard on communication.

We are currently striving to meet the new standards in another way. In anticipation of the new standards, we submitted a proposal to the Philip Morris Foundation to support the development of better program-based performance assessments. We were awarded a grant that would begin a two-year faculty development and assessment development activity. Faculty from across the campus, including faculty in the majors as well as teacher education faculty, have been writing new authentic assessments that will be given to the students completing our redesigned programs. This support has given us the added impetus to develop reliable and valid assessments of our students' performances on the new standards.

To support our new programs, the new assessments and the continuing incorporation of the new standards, the College of Education was reorganized to create the School for the Study of Teaching and Teacher Education as a new unit within the College. The purpose of the School is to bring greater coherence to the redesign of the teacher education programs by having an organizational unit that supports ongoing renewal and redesign. The School is in its first year and will continue to be the unit that initiates and implements continuous renewal of teacher education at UNC.

With regard to the standards of HB 1313, there is still much work to do. Because these standards are only in their second draft and still not accepted by the State Board of Education, we are proceeding cautiously yet responsibly. Many of the subject-specific methods professors in the teacher education programs have already incorporated these standards into their courses. Specifically, we are already sharing the second draft with our students in the methods classes, and are making initial efforts to teach assessment activities to our students that reflect the spirit of the standards.

Another way we are striving to tie student standards to teacher standards is through the Rocky Mountain Teacher Education Collaborative (RMTEC). RMTEC, which is a collaboration among the colleges of education and arts and sciences at UNC, Metropolitan State College and Colorado State University, will consider the implication of K-12 content standards for college teaching and curriculum in mathematics and science. Faculty from these three institutions in the sciences and in mathematics are beginning a long-term project to redesign the major and the teaching strategies employed by these professors to improve university student achievement in these disciplines. These areas are undergoing revision expressly to improve the content base for pedagogy in these areas. This program can serve as a prototype for improving pedagogy in other content areas.

In the area of graduate education for teachers, we have already piloted a new Interdisciplinary Master's degree program that marries the teacher licensure standards with the new (student) content standards. This program, field-tested in Denver and Glenwood Springs, received remarkably high evaluations from the students. In brief, this Master's program was designed for elementary and middle grades teachers who want to improve their knowledge of the discipline (science in Denver, and language arts in Glenwood Springs) in an authentic assessment environment. This was our first attempt to bring the standards for teachers and the content standards for students into one program that is designed to strengthen teacher content knowledge and pedagogy simultaneously. It is our belief that this program with its consideration of relicensure, which includes a standard on content-based pedagogy, will increase teachers' knowledge and skills in the spirit of standards-based education. While we are pleased with our first effort, we will continue to refine this Master's degree program for teachers who want to stay in the classroom.

It is premature to make definitive statements about the effects of these various changes. We believe that we are headed in the right direction. We are bringing standards for licensure and relicensure to our programs while at the same time incorporating student content standards into those traditional disciplines where the faculty are willing to collaborate with the College of Education, and we are incorporating them into our College's methods classes for preservice teachers.

C. What are schools of education doing to assist in the development of induction programs?

HB 1005 does not specifically require school districts to collaborate with institutions of higher education for their induction programs. The districts are free to design their own induction programs. They can choose to collaborate with higher education and they are even free to contract with a private consultant. When it comes to induction, it must be made clear that institutions of higher education are on the outside looking in. It must also be noted that the legislature did not fund induction programs, making it more difficult for superintendents to help beginning educators get their feet on the ground.

Within this context, we are attaching a set of materials that graphically display the program the UNC College of Education designed to assist schools in implementing their induction programs. As you will see, we have offered an array of cash-funded programs to local school administrators. The services range from small-scale workshops to rather involved ongoing activities that keep the school district and the College working together with their induction candidates.

The spirit of these activities is to develop the capacity of the schools to design and implement their own induction programs with eventual minimal University participation. It is our belief that because no one was funded under HB 1005 to run induction programs, we, as Colorado's primary institution for education, are still obligated to help a local school district learn to implement its own induction program. Thus, most of the activities are intended to build the capacity of the district to

operate its own induction program. The College will always be available for assistance, but the strength of an induction program really comes from the integrity it has, and that comes from the internal commitments of a district to mentor its own beginning educators. The College remains ready to assist wherever it can. Once again, we have created a **Center for Induction** in the School for the Study of Teaching and Teacher Education. It is intended that the coordinator for the Center will facilitate the College's work toward improving lifelong teacher education by collaborating on coherent induction programs.

The following attachment describes the services available in the College of Education.

FORT LEWIS COLLEGE

DURANGO, COLORADO 81301

November 27, 1994

To: Tim Grieder, Chair, Teacher Education Strategic Planning Panel

From: Steve Roderick, Dean of Education
Ginny Engman, Chair of Teacher Education Ginny Engman

Re: Request for Information on Changes in Teacher Education Programs resulting from Initiation of K-12 Standards-Based Education

Question: What are some specific examples of how teacher education curricula are introducing standards-based education?

The Teacher Education Department has responded in several ways to the initiation of standards-based education:
(1) infusion of HB 93-1313 into methods courses; requirement that teacher candidates design alternative assessments of learning which are measured against pre-set standards.
(2) assessment of teacher candidates themselves based on pre-measure of performance at the beginning of program and a post-measure at the conclusion of student teaching. The performance measure includes standards in the areas of instructional strategy, planning & organization, and management and motivation.
(3) requirement that teacher candidates admitted to the program after Dec. 31, 1993 must develop a professional portfolio to be reviewed by a panel of three faculty from throughout the college. Approval of the portfolio is necessary before institutional recommendation for licensure is given.

Question: What are schools of education doing to assist in the development of induction programs?

Fort Lewis Teacher Education Department has been instrumental in the development of induction programs for five area districts within the San Juan BOCS region. The Chair of the Department serves as the Director of the Induction Program and facilitates monthly meetings of mentors and inductees. Topics for the meetings include: development of performance criteria (for individual inductees) based on the program goals; concerns theory as it relates to the new teacher/administrator; developing the professional portfolio; the Licensure Law; and legal & ethical issues confronting our profession. Additionally, Southwest BOCS has requested that we give assistance in starting an induction program for the districts it serves. Discussions are currently underway.

If you need further information on either of the above questions, please let us know.

Metropolitan State College of Denver

INTERMEMO

TO: Tim Grieder, Academic Officer; Director of Continuing Education; Chair, Teacher Education Strategic Planning Panel

FROM: Mark O'Shea, Director mad
Professional Education

RE: Teacher Education: HB93-1313 and Teacher Induction Programs

DATE: 12/4/94

Your memorandum of 10/28/94 was brought to my attention just yesterday. Hopefully, the following comments will be helpful.

The teacher education program at MSCD is a joint effort of the School of Letters, Arts, and Sciences and the School of Professional Studies. Through the organization of a Professional Education Unit that includes all faculty, students, and administrators who regularly teach, advise, or serve teacher education students, we are prepared to address curriculum issues in general studies, professional studies, and specialty (subject majors) areas. This new organizational structure, brought forward by Dean Bill Rader, can respond effectively to the new standards when they are approved. Certainly, departments of teacher education that are responsible for pedagogy, should not be held solely accountable for student achievement of content taught by departments in the School of Letters, Arts, and Sciences.

Moreover, the information I have been receiving about unexpectedly high outcomes by teacher candidates on the PLACE exams suggests that Colorado institutions of Higher Education are preparing their teacher candidates quite well in both pedagogy and content. This not withstanding, it would be premature to suggest that standards achievement is directly related to teacher preparation rather than other important factors including parental support for education, supportive home environments, and related critical factors.

Here at MSCD I am working closely with Dr. Joe Raab and Dr. Larry Johnson along with community members, industrial representatives, and dedicated staff of the Denver Public Schools on D-CONNECT, the regional effort to help Denver Public School children achieve standards in Science and Mathematics. Additionally, Dr. Jim Loats

Division of Education
Campus Box 87
P.O. Box 173362
Denver, Colorado 80217-3362
Office: (303) 556-4691
Fax: (303) 556-3725

and Dr. Marilyn Taylor are leading MSCD faculty in improving collegiate math and science teaching for prospective teachers through the Rocky Mountain Teacher Education Collaborative. These two projects are part of $15,000,000 dollars in NSF funded teaching improvement activity focused on standards achievement. Creative faculty from CSU, UNC, and MSCD have garnered substantial federal dollars to help meet Colorado's HB93-1313 unfunded mandates. Significant publicity has accompanied these efforts. Clearly, "opinion that teacher education programs are not on top of the need to respond and change" is uninformed by this publicity.

During the summer of 1994, MSCD initiated its mentor teacher training seminars for public school teachers who would serve as mentors in teacher induction programs. These seminars will be offered again in 1995. Additionally, MSCD is establishing a toll-free phone line for first year teachers who need assistance with their instruction. Last summer, we trained more than twenty teachers for the Sheridan, Denver, and Adams County Schools. We have been planning with the human resources department of Denver Public Schools for mentor training and other support services to be offered by MSCD in the future.

Hopefully, these activity descriptions are responsive to your inquiry. If you are in need of additional detail, I can be reached at 556-4691.

Adams State College
ALAMOSA, COLORADO 81102

School of Education and Behavioral Science / (719) 589-7936

MEMORANDUM

TO: Tim Grieder

FROM: Mil Clark, Dean
School of Education and Behavioral Science

DATE: November 29, 1994

SUBJECT: Changes in Teacher Education Programs Resulting from Initiation of K-12 Standards-Based Education

a.) What is higher education doing to meet the licensure changes?

Adams State College is in the process of reviewing its entire teacher preparation program in response to newly revised NCATE standards and newly revised Colorado Department of Education standards for the preparation of teachers. The overall program, and individual courses within the program, are being revised to reflect changes in both the NCATE and CDE standards. Revisions will emphasize the preparation of prospective teachers to teach in K-12 schools with standards-based curricula, the use of instructional technology as a teaching tool, preparation for teaching in culturally diverse classrooms, the development of strong communication skills and the acquisition of a strong subject-matter knowledge base. Program review and revision will be completed by the end of Spring Semester 1995.

b.) What are some specific examples of how teacher education curricula are introducing standards-based education (e.g., standards setting, new assessment practices)?

Knowing that Colorado would likely be moving to standards-based curricula in its public schools, Adams State College began to work with its faculty, as well as public school teachers, to prepare for this

move two years ago. Over the past two years, the College has sponsored on-campus workshops on standards and the assessment of students based on standards by the following individuals/agencies:

William Spady - Summer 1992,
Bruce Joyce - Summer 1993,
Helen Burz - Summer 1993,
MCREL - Summer 1994.

Additionally, several teacher education faculty have been participants in standards-based conferences off campus.

As a result of the preliminary work outlined above, the teacher education faculty have already implemented the following into our teacher preparation program:

-The draft K-12 curriculum standards have been integrated into social studies and language arts methods courses at both the undergraduate and graduate levels;

-Lesson plans developed by student teachers must reference specific state standards addressed in the plan;

-The teacher preparation program, as a part of the review process cited in a.) above, is currently incorporating new CDE teacher education standards, to be completed by the end of Spring Semester 1995. Completion of a standards-based teacher preparation program should prepare future teachers to be more effective in standards-based curricula in K-12 schools.

-Colorado draft standards for K-12 curricula have been distributed to all academic departments on campus that are involved in teacher education. The academic departments have been advised of their role in preparing future teachers who can teach to the standards of their discipline.

-Academic departments have purchased copies of national standards that have been developed for their fields, e.g. mathematics, geography.

c.) What are schools of education doing to assist in the development of induction programs?

For the past eight years, Adams State College has worked with the fourteen school districts in the San Luis Valley to provide an induction program for

beginning teachers. In the past, the program has been voluntary. Beginning teachers and their mentors have participated in bi-monthly sessions on campus that have been coordinated by a teacher education faculty member as a part of her teaching assignment. The School of Education and Behavioral Science budget has contained a modest line item amount to cover expenses of the program. Activities of the program have been determined by mentor teachers and beginning teachers, past and present. Training of mentors has been a part of the program and activities for beginning teachers have reflected their needs in making the transition from a teacher preparation program to their position as a fulltime classroom teacher.

Adams State College is currently taking the lead in working with the fourteen school districts of the San Luis Valley and the SLV BOCS to develop a consortium teacher induction program in response to Colorado Department of Education guidelines. Adams State College will continue to play a significant role in the new program along with an expanded role for individual school districts. It is anticipated that the consortium induction plan will be presented to the State Board of Education for approval in early 1995.

Colorado State University

November 29, 1994

College of Applied ~~Human~~ Sciences
Office of the Dean
Fort Collins, Colorado 80523
(303) 491-6331
FAX: (303) 491-7859

Tim Grieder
Academic Officer and Director
Continuing Education and Extended Academic Programs
Department of Higher Education
1300 Broadway
Denver, CO 80203

Dear Tim:

I have had the opportunity to discuss your questions with our teacher licensure committee. Our responses to the questions are as follows:

(a) What is higher education doing to meet the licensure changes?

Our teacher licensure faculty in the School of Education have been meeting on a weekly basis since the beginning of this academic semester in order to address the new teacher licensure changes (i.e. the Educator Licensing Act of 1991). We recognize that initially our committee efforts are focused in three areas: (a) the development of a clear and focused mission and vision statement for our teacher preparation program at Colorado State University. (b) the identification and refinement of the new program structure for the teacher licensure program which incorporates the sub-areas found in standard 5.0 of the Educator Licensing Act, 1991. (c) comprehensive discussion on the establishment of new teacher licensure admission requirements which adequately meet the licensure changes. As well, our future deliberations will call for the development of an integrated and collaborative approach with public school systems as they offer induction programs to provisional teachers.

To date the teacher licensure committee has developed a mission statement which is reflective of our philosophies and is sensitive to the new teacher licensure changes. Our committee also has considered simultaneously the overall preparation program for teacher licensure and the admission standards which are inherent within discussion of the new program. At a faculty retreat a first draft model of a new teacher licensure program was drafted. It is the intent of this committee to review this model again on November 28 and to move further with its refinement.

Other efforts which we have endeavored to undertake in order to meet the teacher licensure changes include (a) modifying the content checksheets to reflect the new changes, enhancing the education of our students, faculty, and administration as it pertains to the new teacher licensure laws, and strengthening our channels of communication with the Colorado

Department of Education. We have also attempted to strengthen our collegial relationships with arts and science faculty.

(b) What are some specific examples of how teacher education curricula are introducing standards-based education (e.g., standard-setting, new assessment practices)?

To date, there have been a number of unique and very specific activities which have been undertaken by specific faculty and/or programs in teacher licensure at Colorado State University. The RMTEC program has conducted an extensive analysis of the standards and has prepared a preliminary design of their program with the intent of allowing students to know these new standards and to be able to teach to these new standards. A number of our faculty are currently engaged in collaborative relationships with the Poudre R-1 and the Thompson R2-J school districts in assisting these school districts with the development of their standards-based education programs. The teacher licensure committee has also attempted to clarify the specific content areas of the new standards as identified in section 5 of the Teacher Licensure Law. In fact, the draft of the new program structure in teacher licensure in the School of Education is a reflection of our group's efforts in synthesizing and relating to these new standards. CSU currently has three professional development schools. Students and faculty are exposed and participate in to discussions of standards while working in the schools.

(c) What are schools of education doing to assist in the development of induction programs?

The School of Education has traditionally offered a course for cooperating teachers during the spring semester. This course is being refined at this time in order to accommodate the needs of mentor teachers and teachers participating in the induction program (i.e. first or second year teachers). The teacher licensure committee members have expressed a strong commitment to the continuum of educational experiences (i.e. teacher preparation and teacher induction). This is an area, although still being developed, that will be emphasized at Colorado State University as we move forward in the design of a teacher preparation program.

I do believe that our efforts are moving along and will be finalized by the end of this year. I am pleased with the commitment and the enthusiasm with which our teacher licensure faculty approach this change process. If you have any specific questions, please feel free to give me a call.

Yours truly,

Nancy Hartley

Nancy Hartley
Dean

cc: Dave Whaley, Cathy Love, Ellie Gilfoyle

University of Colorado at Denver

School of Education

Campus Box 106
P.O. Box 173364
Denver, Colorado 80217-3364
Phone: (303) 556-2717
Fax: (303) 556-4479

MEMORANDUM

TO: Tim Grieder
Academic Officer, CCHE

FROM: G. Thomas Bellamy, Dean
UCD School of Education

SUBJECT: Your Request of October 28, 1994

DATE: November 30, 1994

This memorandum responds to your request for information on how the UCD School of Education is responding to the legislative requirements related to licensure, standards, and induction.

I. Licensing Requirements

While you indicated that you had sufficient information concerning implementation of the licensure requirement, a brief note may be helpful. The UCD revised both its Initial Teacher Education program and its Principal preparation program during the 1993-94 school year, in order to meet the emerging revised licensure requirements. These new programs were reviewed and approved in April, 1994, under the existing Department of Education regulations, but were designed to meet the requirements that went into effect in July, 1994. New admissions to the previous programs were discontinued in Spring, 1994, and the new programs initiated in Summer 1994. We believe that the preparation programs we now offer fully meet the requirements of the Licensure Act and associated CDE regulations.

II. Standards

Your second request related to the content standards required in HB 1313. The Initial Teacher Education program at the University of Colorado at Denver addresses national standards and developing Colorado standards in a number of courses designed to prepare elementary and secondary teachers. Listed below are each of those courses with information provided about how the standards are currently being addressed. Once the Colorado standards are firmly in place, the standards will become more central to courses and more central in the projects that students engage in during the courses, particularly curriculum development and assessment projects.

It should be noted that we have addressed standards in courses since they first became a priority at the national level. A number of UCD faculty have been involved in the development and discussion of national, state and district standards and see the state standards as a natural evolution of the national standards movement. As a result of faculty involvement, national standards have been addressed in courses for a number of

years and state standards are a natural addition to the presentations and assignments in courses and field work.

A. All teacher candidates

Whether teacher candidates are preparing for elementary or secondary teaching positions, they take the following courses that address national and state standards:

(1) Foundations/philosophy course: In this course, various philosophies of education are reviewed. The standards movement in general and the development and nature of the Colorado standards in particular are used as an example of the consequences of one of the philosophies of education.

(2) School residencies: Teacher candidates enroll in three school residencies during their teacher preparation program with the final school residency most like student teaching. Because we have placed all teacher candidates in fourteen partner schools for these school residencies, we expect to be able to address the implementation of the state standards in these fourteen schools once they are adopted and school districts have implemented them locally. In some partner schools, standards are already in place at the district level that meet or exceed state standards (as they are developing) and we require teacher candidates to utilize those standards in developing and delivering instruction and in conducting assessment. Some of our partner schools have also embarked on self-study and renewal projects that relate to standards. For example, Edison Elementary, a partner school that works with 13 of our teacher candidates, is engaged in developing literacy assessments that are connected to the developing state standards in reading and writing.

(3) Seminars: Teacher candidates are enrolled in a series of seminars as they prepare to become teachers and spend their first year as licensed teachers. The seminars are designed to develop a particular area of expertise in each teacher candidate/new teacher. Thus, there is a group of teacher candidates who will have particular areas of expertise in math, in science, and in literacy; these candidates in particular are becoming well-schooled with regards to national and state standards in their areas of expertise. We expect these teacher candidates to serve as resources to the schools and districts that hire them. In addition, all teacher candidates, no matter their area of expertise, will be expected in these seminars to develop an instruction and assessment plan for their first year of teaching that must reveal utilization of the state content standards as appropriate to the grade level and license they are seeking or have earned. That is, a newly licensed teacher who has obtained a teaching position in the fourth grade will need to show how s/he has planned instruction and assessment to include the fourth grade level standards in reading, writing, math, science, history and geography.

B. Elementary teacher candidates

All elementary teacher candidates at UCD take a 12 hour methods block in which elementary level content area instruction and assessment is addressed. Teacher candidates enrolled in this course during this semester reviewed national standards in each of the content areas as well as the drafts of all Colorado standards. They were assigned to 1) develop an integrated unit in which they showed how they addressed the instruction and assessment of these standards, and 2) to review the related standards in the district in which they were doing their school residencies in order to ascertain whether standards existed and if so, how they were similar and different from state and national standards. Because the course is based on the idea that elementary content instruction should be of an integrated nature, we help teacher candidates understand how to address a number of standards in a single lesson or unit of study.

C. Secondary teacher candidates

Each teacher candidate preparing for a secondary teaching position specializes in a content area: English, math, science, or social studies. Each teacher candidate takes a general methods course as well as two methods courses specific to the content area that they will teach.

(1) General methods course: In this course, students sometimes worked in discipline specific groups. In these groups of future math, science, social studies, and English teachers, they engaged in these activities related to Colorado standards:

a. Teacher candidates engaged in discipline area group study of the standards using the technique of expert jigsaw. The math group studied the Colorado math standards, the science group studied the Colorado science standards, the English group studied the Colorado reading and writing standards, and the social studies group studied the history and geography standards. The groups also helped each other understand how they might be responsible for each other's standards in the classroom. For example, there was a great deal of discussion about how all content area teachers could be responsible for students meeting the reading and writing standards at the middle and high school levels.

b. Colorado standards were used by the discipline groups to generate measurable objectives using Bloom's taxonomy.

c. Discipline groups generated lessons in which they could teach students about current events and address state standards simultaneously.

d. Individual teacher candidates were required to utilize state standards in developing units of study in their discipline.

(2) Specific methods courses: The national and state standards are addressed specifically in each of the content specific methods courses as follows:

a. National and state standards (in their draft form) are compared and contrasted. For example, the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics standards are compared and contrasted with Colorado standards.

b. Examples of lessons and activities implied by the standards are provided and teacher candidates are expected to use and generate them in assignments.

c. Assessments for measuring the attainments of standards are provided and teacher candidates are expected to use and generate them in assignments.

d. Professors who have been involved in the development of standards help teacher candidates understand how standards are affected by public response and legislative input.

e. As a result of UCD's partnership with Adams 12 and CONNECT, the state systemic initiative to implement standards-based education in math and science, 20 of our teacher candidates each year work with 3 partner schools in Adams 12 to implement standards-based education in those two content areas. These experiences are often the bases for discussion in the methods classes in which the teacher candidates are concurrently enrolled.

D. Advanced Programs

In addition to the Initial Teacher Education program, the UCD faculty also addresses specific standards in master's programs designed to provide licensed teachers with greater expertise in selected areas of the curriculum. Examples of that are:

1. Teachers who enroll in the master's program in Reading and Writing and earn a Reading Teacher endorsement in Colorado have been directly involved in the discussion and development of Colorado's reading and writing standards. Two of the program's professors were on the state committee that generated the standards and involved students in reviewing and critiquing the standards as they evolved. The teachers who graduate from this program are also fully prepared to conduct reading and writing assessments that are aligned with the standards and to provide leadership in their respective schools and districts with regard to instruction and assessment aligned with Colorado standards.

2. Teachers enrolled in the program leading to a master's degree in Curriculum and Instruction may elect to specialize in mathematics instruction. In addition to engaging in the study of the national and state math standards and their implications for instruction, the standards play a major role in a course designed to assist teacher in understanding how to assess students' understanding of mathematics based on national and state standards.

III. Induction

The final aspect of your request related to the induction programs required of school districts. So far our response consists of two parts.

First, the new Initial Teacher Education program has been restructured to provide induction support to new teachers during their first year of teaching. Newly licensed teachers take the following courses during their first year of teaching:

Teacher Inquiry: This course is designed to help new teachers critically reflect on and study or evaluate selected experiences during their first year of teaching. The course requires new teachers to define and solve instructional problems they encounter and in the process, to develop a greater understanding of strategies and methods for conducting classroom and beyond-the-classroom inquiry that help them explore important questions about teaching and learning. The new teachers will conduct inquiries in collaboration with mentor teachers when possible.

Principles of Change and Collaboration: Also designed to support new teachers in learning about and effectively operating in their first school assignment, this course help new teachers understand and engage effectively in the process of change and collaboration in the school, district, and community.

Leadership Area Seminar: In this course, new teachers continue to be supported by the professor(s) who mentored them during their teacher preparation program and continue to gain and utilize expertise in a particular area of teaching. New teachers will engage in peer coaching, coaching by mentor teachers when possible, video analysis of teaching, discussion of problems encountered in the school and beyond, and continued development of their teaching portfolios.

Second, through the Colorado Principals' Center at UCD we have offered induction support for several years to new principals in the metropolitan area. to strengthen this induction support , we have recently proposed a partnership with the Denver Area Superintendents Council which would coordinate the districts' own leadership development efforts with our principal preparation and induction program. As the partnership develops, we expect to offer even more support to beginning principals in the region.

c: Vice Chancellor Gerogia Lesh Laurie

Draft Codification of CCHE Teacher Education Policy

SECTION I

PART R POLICIES ON TEACHER EDUCATION

This codification of policies is based on policies articulated in the Commission's 1986 report to the Colorado General Assembly culminating the Commission study of the academic field of teacher education mandated in statute (21-1-116, Colorado Revised Statutes). In addition, policies originating from the Commission's strategic planning project in teacher education, 1993-1995, are integrated.

The term "teacher education" encompasses all programs to train K-12 teachers, both pre-service (prior to initial employment as a teacher) and in-service professional development. In a generic sense, programs to train administrators and other education professionals for positions in K-12 schools also may be included under this term.

1.00 The Configuration for Delivery of Education Programs

1.01 Geographic Access

1.01.01 Maximum geographic access to baccalaureate degrees and initial licensure should be provided.

1.01.02 Substantial access is needed, with options in both coursework and geographic access (including telecommunications) for continuing education and relicensure programs beyond the baccalaureate degree.

1.01.03 Regional access is needed to master's degrees delivered by state institutions having broad graduate offerings and scope. Institutions may propose graduate education programs for which they can conclusively document that they have the capacity to offer at a high level of quality, and that will serve regional access needs. Administrative licensure programs may be proposed when they will serve documented need in the state of Colorado.

1.01.04 Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.), Doctor of Education (Ed.D.), or Educational Specialist (Ed.S.) degrees should be offered by a limited number of institutions (but more than one) or by consortial arrangements.

**Text in italics is based on recommendations of the Teacher Education Strategic Planning Panel.*

1.02 Minority Access

Minority access must continue to be a direct responsibility of each governing board and institution.

2.00 Quality Degree Programs

2.01 Rigorous Programs

Every institution offering teacher licensure should ensure the development of a rigorous, focused curriculum at both the bachelor's degree level and, as appropriate, at the master's degree level. (See 3.01.01 for essential program elements.)

2.02 Minimum FTE Faculty

No education program should have fewer than three full-time equivalent faculty in order to provide a depth of intellectual inquiry and pedagogical training.

2.03 Bachelor's Degrees in Academic Field Required

At the undergraduate level, teacher candidates must major in a subject field or select an interdisciplinary major that meets certain quality standards. (See section 3.03.04, below.) Bachelor's degrees in education shall not be offered (except for music education programs accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music).

2.04 Requirements for Quality Graduate Programs

2.04.01 Breadth of Graduate Support Programs

Graduate programs in teacher education should be provided through institutions having broad graduate offerings and scope. The programs should draw upon the wide variety of disciplines required of teachers and administrators, rather than on programs provided solely by the faculties of education.

Programs for advanced training must recognize the multidisciplinary needs of both the teacher and administrator and must draw on the diverse talents of faculty from a wide variety of disciplines.

2.04.02 Provisions for Rural Access

Where rural access is a major goal, graduate education programs that do not require extensive graduate level support from other academic disciplines can be offered by a regional institution. Criteria for selecting the regional institution will

include "existing assets," where quality programming already exists, and where access to a large teacher population is feasible.

Proposals for new graduate programs in education, especially at institutions serving rural access needs, should conclusively document that the programs are needed, that they serve regional access needs, and that the sponsoring institution has the capacity to offer a high quality program.

3.00 Structure and Length of Teacher Education Programs

3.01 Structure and Length of Teacher Education Programs

3.01.01 Program Elements

Programs for future teachers must contain three critical elements: a liberal arts and sciences, or general education core; a major in a subject field; and pedagogy. To insure an appropriate focus on all areas, pedagogy, cannot unduly expand. Teacher licensure requirements, including student teaching, should be between 20 and 42 hours or, if alternative delivery and assessment models are adopted, teacher licensure requirements should constitute not less than 20 percent nor more than 33 percent of a student's undergraduate program.

3.01.02 Length of Degree Programs Leading to Initial Licensure

The basic teacher education program should be planned so that all elements of programs leading to the bachelor's degree and to initial licensure can be completed in eight semesters. In order to complete the program in eight semesters the student would be expected to enter the institution at the freshman year, carry a full load of courses, complete all courses satisfactorily, not change majors after the start of the third year, and meet all entrance requirements specific to the institution's teacher education program. Exceptions to the eight semester standard will be allowed for certain academic fields when evidence is provided to the Commission substantiating the necessity for extended programs.

3.02 Admission of Non-Traditional Students

Baccalaureate level teacher education programs shall be open to post-baccalaureate non-traditional students.

3.03 Post-Baccalaureate and Graduate Level Teacher Education Programs

3.03.01 Teacher Education Courses Shall be at the Undergraduate Level

Preservice teacher licensure courses, including those incorporated into graduate degree programs, shall be undergraduate courses at the upper division level. Such courses shall be the same courses as provided to undergraduate students as part of baccalaureate programs.

3.03.02 Licensure Program at the Master's Level

Programs that require entrance into a master's degree program for initial teacher licensure shall not be established by any institution. Master's degree programs that incorporate certification/licensure requirements in operation in the academic year 1994-95 may continue through June 30, 1998. To continue past that date, the sponsoring institution shall have presented a proposal to the Commission on Higher Education that provides a rationale for the program and describes the costs of the program and shall have received formal approval from the Commission. Areas of professional education where state policy requires master's level training (e.g., school psychology) are excepted.

3.03.03 Five Year Baccalaureate Programs in Education

A five year baccalaureate program is not justified as state policy based on the increased cost to students and the state.

3.03.04 Interdisciplinary Major

An interdisciplinary bachelor's degree is acceptable for students preparing to be teachers when the interdisciplinary program has demonstrated to the Commission on Higher Education that it meets the following criteria:

- *The interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary major shall not include courses meeting general education requirements.*
- *The interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary major is to be constituted entirely by academic content and shall not include pedagogy or licensure requirements.*
- *The major shall not be created solely or primarily for teacher education candidates.*
- *One discipline among the two or more constituting the interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary degree should be emphasized.*
- *Courses integrating or synthesizing the subject area should be required.*

- *There should be rigor in the academic requirements (e.g., a certain number of upper division courses).*

- *The academic areas that may constitute an acceptable interdisciplinary major are those that constitute a core body of knowledge or unifying research methodology (e.g., mathematics and science, social science, humanities).*

Institutions should submit proposals for the establishment of new interdisciplinary programs for teachers to the Commission for review and approval.

4.00 Institutional Roles in Graduate Professional Education

4.01.01 Institutions Governed by the Board of Regents of The University of Colorado

The University of Colorado shall not offer the doctorate in elementary education.

The University of Colorado is generally restricted in delivery of off-campus programs to the seven county area composed of Boulder, Adams, Jefferson, Denver, Arapahoe, Douglas, and El Paso counties.

4.01.02 The University of Colorado at Boulder

The University of Colorado at Boulder has responsibility for master's and doctoral programs in research and evaluation, bilingual education, secondary education, and elementary education at the master's level only. The University of Colorado at Boulder shall not offer counseling and guidance or administration programs.

4.01.03 The University of Colorado at Denver

The University of Colorado at Denver has responsibility for master's level programs in elementary education, secondary education, counseling, bilingual education, special education, and administration. Educational administration programs at both the master's and doctoral levels are to be offered only at the University of Colorado at Denver.

4.01.04 The University of Colorado at Colorado Springs

The University of Colorado at Colorado Springs has responsibility for master's level programs in elementary education, secondary education, counseling, and special education.

4.02 Institutions Governed by the State Board of Agriculture

4.02.01 Colorado State University

Colorado State University has exclusive responsibility for graduate vocational teacher education. Colorado State University shall offer only vocational teacher education at the graduate level.

4.02.02 University of Southern Colorado

No specific authority in teacher education is granted to the University of Southern Colorado.

4.02.03 Ft. Lewis College

No specific authority in teacher education is granted to Ft. Lewis College

4.03 Trustees of the University of Northern Colorado -- the University of Northern Colorado

The University of Northern Colorado shall not offer vocational education degrees, but may offer undergraduate certification programs in vocational education.

The University of Northern Colorado has a statewide responsibility in teacher education in all types of graduate education except vocational teacher education. It has exclusive responsibility for doctoral elementary education programs.

4.04 Institutions Governed by the Trustees of The State Colleges in Colorado

4.04.01 Adams State College

Adams State College may propose master's degrees to serve access needs in its region. *Proposals for new master's degrees shall conclusively document need for the program, that regional access needs are served, and that the college has the capacity to offer a high quality program.*

4.04.02 Mesa State College

Mesa State College may propose master's degrees to serve access needs in its region. *Proposals for new master's degrees shall conclusively document need for the program, that regional access needs are served, and that the college has the capacity to offer a high quality program.*

4.04.03 Western State College

Western State College shall not offer master's degrees in education.

4.04.04 Metropolitan State College of Denver

No specific authority in teacher education is granted to Metropolitan State College of Denver.